

BRYAN'S N. Y. SPEECH

SILVER CHAMPION ROUSES HIS HEARERS TO ENTHUSIASM.

Men and Women Cheer Until They are Hoarse—His Speech At Every Point.

(Boston Globe.)

New York.—(Special.)—If the democratic club's \$10 dinner at the Metropolitan opera house was splendid as a spectacle, the Chicago platform demonstration at the Grand Central palace tonight was magnificent in its manifestation of enthusiasm for Wm. J. Bryan and the principles he represents.

The dollar diners arrived early and remained until they had seen the last of their hero.

The first of the began to drift into the hall as early as 5:30 o'clock. They sat down and patiently waited. Workday clothes. All these had apparently but one object in view, and that was to see and hear Mr. Bryan.

When the leader did appear at the great entrance to the banquet hall 3,000 men arose from their seats and cheered as one. The women who had left the gallery boxes to dine on their own account in their own particular room came hurrying back and joined in the tremendous welcome.

The blare of the trumpets playing "Hail to the Chief" was overcome and lost in the mighty chorus of the thousands of voices. Men forgot that they had dinner tables in front of them and jumped upon them to get a better view of Mr. Bryan. The air was rent with cheers, with inarticulate shouts of jubilation. Women lent their voices to the general acclaim, and, in a word, 4,000 staid and usually sober people seemed to have become delirious from joy.

Mr. Bryan walked down the center aisle leaning upon the arm of Eugene V. Brewster, chairman of the committee of arrangements.

When Mr. Bryan reached his place at the guest table the diners broke loose again, and for several minutes the noise of their cheering was deafening. One man jumped on the platform and proposed "three cheers for our next president." They were given in a way that made the bunting streamers in the roof space quiver.

Mr. Bryan, perfectly unmoved, smiling genially, beamed upon him admirers like a benevolent schoolmaster. His colleagues at the guest table were apparently dazed at the extent of the demonstration. Not so Mr. Bryan. He has grown so used to big demonstrations that nothing surprises him.

The decorations of the big hall were the national colors and streamers of blue and white bunting in festoons under the glass roof. On the wall behind the stage were hung oil portraits of Thomas Jefferson and Mr. Bryan, backed with the national colors.

Across the chair which Mr. Bryan took when he mounted the platform was hung a large cluster of American Beauty roses tied with a broad crimson ribbon. Upon a card attached to the offering was inscribed: "To William Jennings Bryan from A. S. Townsend of Virginia." Besides the reading desk was displayed a floral horseshoe with the emblem, "Women's Bryan League of Brooklyn—16 to 1."

Chairman Brown said before introducing Mr. Bryan:

"I have been requested, Mr. Bryan, to present to you this bunch of American Beauties in behalf of American admirers, and the donors' inscription is this: 'You, like these roses, are the nation's trust.'"

BRYAN BEGINS.

A tremendous amount of cheering and applause greeted Bryan as he accepted the flowers. He said:

"Mr. Chairman, Democrats, Ladies and Gentlemen: I esteem it a great privilege to be permitted to attend this, probably the largest, banquet ever given in the United States. Interruption of cheers for our man."

"I appreciate the kindness which has been manifested by your action, and by the words of those who have preceded me. I shall carry back to my western home new courage from your meeting and shall be glad to tell to the people of other states in New York that there are those who are true to the principles of democracy as written in democracy's latest creed. (Cries of "Bravo.")

"The object of this banquet was to give Chicago platform democracy the chance to relate the birth of Thomas Jefferson. (Cries of "That's it.")

"There was given a banquet in honor of Thomas Jefferson two nights ago, and the discussion of the price per plate obscured to some extent the difference between that banquet and this. A democrat has a right to pay whatever he pleases for a dinner if he has the money. The character of a political banquet is determined, not by the cost of it, but by the sentiments woven into the post-prandial oratory.

"We have not one word of hostility to utter toward those democrats who left the democratic party in 1896. Far be it from us to criticize any man whose judgment or conscience leads him out of the democratic party.

"When the republicans met at St. Louis some republicans left the party rather than adapt themselves to the platform written out at St. Louis. They organized a distinct party and they took a name sufficiently different from the republican name so that no one would mistake the one for the other. They made a bold fight, and the republicans who left the party in 1896 have neither gone back, nor standing outside have they attempted to write the platform of the party which they left.

"The democrats who left in 1896 organized a distinct party, nominated a ticket and perforce formed a national organization. But instead of naming themselves gold democrats, so that they could not be mistaken for the regular democrats, they called themselves national democrats, though they did not expect to carry a precinct in the United States.

NO POLITICAL BIGAMY.

"The party is an association of people for the purpose of giving force and expression to political opinions in common. They talk to us about harmony. There can be no harmony between those whose opinions are so antagonistic as those set forth in the Chicago platform and the Indianapolis platform.

"All that we ask is that those who come into the democratic party shall be a part of the democratic party. We simply insist that a man cannot be a political bigamist. We simply ask that he shall get a formal divorce, either from our name or their principle.

"Either party those who stand upon it does not deny those who stand upon it to hear it denounced this year by those who denounced it three years ago. We got accustomed to it in 1896, but it was a surprising thing to hear that party denounced by those who left it two years ago. But this we do not hear. The democratic platform is satisfactory to those who supported it in 1896.

"That platform was written by the representatives of the democratic party in the most democratic convention that has been held in a quarter of a century.

NO MORE AMBIGUITY.

"It is a compliment to receive a presidential nomination from any national convention, but I am proud that my nomination came from a convention, not of bosses, but of democratic citizens. (Loud applause.) It has vindicated that platform, and every plank of it is stronger today than it was when the platform was written.

"Those who believe that we should invite into the democratic party all those who cannot share in the purpose and the aspirations of that party—I cannot speak for others; I speak for myself—and I say that I would not abstract from it a single plank or get back every man who left it.

"Nor do I believe we could draw people to us by cowardice. The day for ambiguity has passed. That platform means that in the campaign of 1896 the parties of the people were stirred as they have not been lately by injunction. I will tell you that it was because the struggling masses found in it a menace to every man who robs his neighbor for his own benefit.

"Those who have entrenched themselves behind abuse of government who objected to that government, and well they might object, because that platform was aimed at every abuse of government, and I was glad that I was supported by those who would have only asked me for just laws. I am glad that the 6,500,000 who voted for me simply wanted me to get other people's hands out of their pockets (applause) and not to get their hands into other people's pockets.

"Let me recall some of those planks.

ARBITRATION PLANK.

"The Chicago democrats favored arbitration. Democrats who stood upon it then favor it now. The platform declared against government by injunction, and since the election we have had object lessons which we did not have before.

Thomas Jefferson believed in trial by jury and the government by injunction is merely a disguised method by which a man charged with crime shall be denied the right of trial by jury. (Loud cheers and applause.) That plank is stronger than it was before.

"The Chicago platform declared in favor of an income tax, and an income tax is stronger now than it was before. When I discuss the income tax decision always resort to the platform because I have reputation for conservatism which I must protect. (Laughter.) When I want to be severe I quote, and when I want to be critical I quote. I quote from a member of the court, and when I am so cautious that I even prefer to quote from a republican member who cannot possibly be an anarchist, because he is a republican. (Laughter.)

"I saw in 1896, but many people were so blind that they could not see the danger, but the hour of peril came. The war came on. We needed money. We could not tax incomes because the bankers refused to pay it. We had to resort to stamp taxes, we had to hunt up any old thing to put a stamp on.

DOLLAR AND THE MAN.

"The republican party, in all of its policies is putting the dollar above the man and in this is departing from the doctrine as uttered by its founder, for in 1859 he said the republican party believes in both the man and the dollar, but in cases of conflict the man before the dollar.

"The republican party is not trying to restore justice in taxation. The war has shown that when this government deals with an individual its power is unlimited, but when it deals with the citizen, but it cannot touch the dollar.

"In the hour of peril the nation can take the son from his mother, and the husband from his wife, and stand them up in front of an enemy's gun, but it dare not lay its finger upon the wealth of the rich and make them contribute their share.

"It has been the history of the world that those who can make much have been unwilling to bear their share of the burdens of government and have sought to use the instruments of government for the purpose of enriching themselves, and those who can make less than they can.

"The democratic party is a protector of the rich and the poor, and that party which makes the rich bear their share of the burden is a better friend of the rich man than the party that takes his money and sells exemption.

"There is another plank in this platform which I desire to mention. The republican party and the gold democrats have been burying the money question so often that I feel I almost ought to apologize for speaking of the dead before so large an audience.

"The democratic platform denounced the gold standard and called it un-American and Anti-American and pledged the party to destroy it at once and substitute in its place the independent bimetallic standard at the ratio of 16 to 1.

"In 1896, it is un-American now. If it was anti-American two years ago, it is anti-American now, and if the gold standard was bad in 1896, you were wrong that it was bad in 1897, because Mr. McKinley sent three distinguished commissioners to Europe to get rid of the gold standard.

"And why did they not succeed? It was because they asked of the financiers of the old world a favor that they ought to have known the financiers would not grant. Why did we oppose the gold standard? Because it raised the purchasing power of the products of labor. Then, my friends, I want to suggest to you that the republican promise of international bimetallicism coupled with the pledge that the gold standard would be maintained until the nations came to our relief, was the most absurd plank that any party ever put into a platform. Think of it.

"Let me make a speech, such as a man would have made to carry out a program. If the republican party had delegated its representatives to present this subject to the financiers of Europe along the line of that senseless platform, the spokesmen of the less platform would have to make a speech about like this:

HOW HE WOULD TALK.

"Gentlemen: We have had the gold standard for twenty-three years and do not like it. The American people have tried it and suffered from it, and they have sent us here to ask you to help us get rid of it; they recognize that you have made money while they have lost and therefore we ask you to join us in restoring the state by which we won't lose so much, and by which you won't make so much. (Laughter and loud applause.)

"But then candor would have compelled this spokesman to have added another sentence. He would have said: 'But while we suffered a good deal we have had a hard time we have not reached the limit of endurance, and if you people would rather go on plundering us indefinitely we will stand by you while the world lasts.'

"That is the republican platform. That is what it says, while states try to get along on a national bimetallicism, yet if we get the leading commercial nations of Europe to join with us we will maintain this thing which they want.

AS DEMOCRATS PUT IT.

"My friends, our plan was different. We would not have sent a man over to beg, because we read in history when we were children that not more than 100 years ago our people by their blood bought the right to the people to legislate for themselves.

"According to our plan, when we send a man over there it will not be to ask a man to help us, but to announce to them our law, and if they are going to do (Laughter and applause.)

"It will be to say to them that 70,000,000 of people have as much right to protect their property from depreciation as a handful of foreign financiers have to legislate values into their own hands. And our ambassadors would have said to them: 'The people of the United States have decided to restore international bimetallicism at the ratio of 16 to 1. We believe we can maintain the party, but you have a good many investments over there, and if you have any doubt about our doing it you had better join us, because if anybody suffers it will be you—not us. (Long continued laughter and applause.)

"Now, my friends, an argument like that would have some effect.

SENTIMENT ABROAD.

"But, my friends, why haven't we had international bimetallicism? It is because there is no sentiment in Europe? On the contrary, there is sentiment there, and the sentiment is so strong that the French government joined with us in sending an ambassador to demand that the gold standard be maintained in England. The sentiment was so strong that a petition was sent to the English government, signed by the leading labor organizations of England, asking for international bimetallicism. A strong report was presented while our commission was there, a report signed by four of fourteen members of a commission appointed to investigate the condition of the gold standard in England. The fourteen declared that the gold standard was destructive to English agriculture, and pointed to bimetallicism as the only relief for the English farmer. (Applause.)

"My friends, did the English government refuse to listen to the laboring men and farmers? Because on the 23d day of September, 1897, the bankers of London met at the clearing house, behind closed doors and passed a secret resolution to the effect that the gold standard was all right. The English bankers, so few in number that they can meet in the clearing house, determined the policy of England, and England determined the policy of Europe, and England will determine the policy of the United States as long as the republican party is in power.

DROPPING MONEY QUESTION.

"I have been asked why I am not willing to drop the money question. I replied: 'Because the money question won't drop us. I know not what we will do, but I am not willing that our declaration against the gold standard shall be dropped as long as a handful of English financiers can determine the financial policy of 70,000,000 Americans.'

"And some say that if we will not drop the money question we ought to drop the ratio of 16 to 1. When you find a man opposed to 16 to 1, inquire and you will find there is never a word of it, and then inquire again and you will find there is no other ratio that he is in favor of.

"We denounced international bimetallicism as a delusion and a snare in 1896. It has been proved to be so since 1896. We declared for the ratio of 16 to 1 in 1896, and no party has arisen to advocate any other ratio but 16 to 1.

"When some other party proposes some other ratio and tries to secure it by law, we do not reason why we should discuss ratio with them. The ratio of 16 to 1 was decided upon, not in the Chicago convention, but at the primaries, which elected delegates. The ratio of 16 to 1 has been submitted to the people, and those who wanted it in 1896 are in favor of it now.

"And they know why they are in favor of it. The ratio of 16 to 1 is the ratio at which our gold and silver money circulate. We simply ask reinstatement of the law that was on the statute books—where it was before the act of demonetization was secretly passed. We simply want to give the law back to the people. We raise it up by law; they close the mints by law; we open them by law. (Applause.) They gave gold a monopoly in mint privileges by law, the old competitor we had.

"My friends, you will hear people say that they don't object to silver if we only open the mints at the bullion ratio or the commercial ratio.

A GREATER TRUST.

"It is only when a gold man commences to talk money that he forgets all that he knows of other subjects. When people ask us to drop our fight on the money question and fight the trusts I remember that the republican party is today preoccupied with the industrial trusts combined.

"There is a bill now before congress, reported by the republican committee, that turns over to the national banks the absolute control of the paper money circulation of the country. It provides for the banks drawing 2 1/2 per cent; it provides that banks shall be permitted to issue bills up to the par value of bonds and with the 1 per cent tax on circulation and this shall be reduced to a small fraction of 1 per cent.

"Here is your evidence of good republican policy. They want to issue bonds in place of greenbacks and tax the people to pay the interests on the bonds and they refuse the tax that the banks now pay on the circulation that they have.

"Why pile up the taxes on the people and lower the taxes on the banker? What does it mean? Why, if that law goes into effect and the 2 1/2 per cent bonds are at par then a national bank with capital of \$100,000,000, having \$100,000,000 in bonds, deposit the bonds in the treasury and draw upon the bonds \$100,000 in bank notes, so that the amount the bank gets back is just equal to the amount the bank paid for the bonds. It has no interest on the dollar invested and yet it goes drawing 2 1/2 per cent interest a year on nothing at all. It is a small proposition in mathematics and yet those banks will tell you they want this done for the public good.

"There is another object that is not set forth in the Chicago platform, and is yet included in the principles it sets forth.

THE STANDING ARMY.

"The president in his message of 1898 asked for a standing army of 100,000 men. We have had no national convention to learn that the democratic party is opposed to militarism in the United States. Seventy thousand more soldiers needed for the purpose of international protection? Why, what has happened since 1896, except the republican administration. Does a republican administration make more soldiers necessary? Where prosperity comes and confidence is restored is it necessary to have soldiers to point it out with bayonets?

"How day after day we need them for outside service. Where? In Cuba? Oh, no; not permanently, because the president has promised the Cubans that our occupation is only temporary. Therefore, he would not need soldiers permanently in Cuba.

"Nor are they needed in Porto Rico. My own opinion has been that the people of Porto Rico should be permitted to choose for themselves between annexation and republic of their own. But so far they have expressed no desire for a republic and seem to desire annexation. So that there does not seem to be any necessity for the soldiers there.

"Where do we need a large increase in the army? In the Philippines? Why, my friends? The president in his Boston speech said the question was to be settled by the American people, and until the American people have settled it, how day after day we need 70,000 soldiers there permanently.

"But if we do, according to their argument, need 70,000 soldiers there permanently, then I ask you, my friends, what is the expense going to be? It is estimated that it costs \$1,000 a soldier to keep the army in the United States and \$1,500 a soldier to keep the army outside the United States. Seventy thousand soldiers would mean over \$100,000,000 a year. Who pays the money? The Philippines? Why, my friends, if we make the Philippines pay the expense of our army we will have to tax them several times as much as Spain overtaxed them."

has happened since 1896, except the republican administration. Does a republican administration make more soldiers necessary? Where prosperity comes and confidence is restored is it necessary to have soldiers to point it out with bayonets?

"How day after day we need them for outside service. Where? In Cuba? Oh, no; not permanently, because the president has promised the Cubans that our occupation is only temporary. Therefore, he would not need soldiers permanently in Cuba.

"Nor are they needed in Porto Rico. My own opinion has been that the people of Porto Rico should be permitted to choose for themselves between annexation and republic of their own. But so far they have expressed no desire for a republic and seem to desire annexation. So that there does not seem to be any necessity for the soldiers there.

"Where do we need a large increase in the army? In the Philippines? Why, my friends? The president in his Boston speech said the question was to be settled by the American people, and until the American people have settled it, how day after day we need 70,000 soldiers there permanently.

"But if we do, according to their argument, need 70,000 soldiers there permanently, then I ask you, my friends, what is the expense going to be? It is estimated that it costs \$1,000 a soldier to keep the army in the United States and \$1,500 a soldier to keep the army outside the United States. Seventy thousand soldiers would mean over \$100,000,000 a year. Who pays the money? The Philippines? Why, my friends, if we make the Philippines pay the expense of our army we will have to tax them several times as much as Spain overtaxed them."

TO CALL FOR MORE MEN.

President Confers with Other Officials, but Decides to Wait.

Washington, D. C.—(Special.)—A conference held at the White house between the president, Secretary Alger, Secretary of War, and other officials, resulted in the confirmation of the original decision of the cabinet to at present refrain from availing itself of the authorization conferred by congress to organize a volunteer army of 35,000 soldiers in addition to the present regular army.

The matter of returning the volunteers was also discussed. The department is arranging for the return of the United States as soon as the necessary transportation can be secured.

To General Otis has been left the selection of the organizations to be sent home first, and it is expected that he will follow the plan he has outlined of relieving first the men who have been longest in the Philippines.

General Otis' latest cablegram descriptive of the conditions in the Philippines was carefully considered, and it was concluded to accept his estimate from the military needs of the case, so that as he has already indicated that his present army is sufficient for the campaign he has in view, the decision is tantamount to a resolve to avoid recourse to the additional volunteers.

A cablegram was sent to General Otis, however, called forth by the necessity for withdrawing the state volunteers from the Philippines, again asking him whether he would need more men after he has received the reinforcements now on the way to Manila or under orders to embark as soon as transportation can be secured.

Otis now has a force believed to aggregate about 22,000 effective men. Secretary Alger informed him that the troops now on the way and to be ordered would give him an army of about 35,000 men, after allowing for the return of the state volunteers. This is believed at the war department to meet all of the needs of the summer season.

It is intended to withdraw one regiment from Porto Rico and to send three regiments now in this country to the Philippines as soon as they can be equipped and transported there, though it is not believed that they will reach Manila for two or three months. It is also stated that the conditions in the country are such that it is quite probable some troops can be withdrawn from that island for service in the Philippines.

SHORT REST FOR NEBRASKANS

Regiment Recuperates in Historic Blockhouses After Exertions.

Camp Santa Mesa, Near Manila. —The First Nebraska and the First Colorado have exchanged positions on the firing line, the Colorado occupying the position at the water works. Colonel Stotsenberg requested General Hale to send him reinforcements or relief, as his men were in need of a chance to rest, having been almost constantly on duty since they had taken the country of insurgents from San Juan del Monte to the Maraguina valley, but had held its positions by continued fighting, forcing back the insurgents in their repeated attempts to recapture the pumping station. In accomplishing this the regiment had to use the greatest vigilance. It was necessary to call upon the men every other night and sometimes every night for guard and outpost duty. Owing to the amount of territory we were protecting it called for a large number of posts. Taking this in conjunction with the other hardships which are bound to appear in the field of action, the men needed a chance to recuperate. General Hale thus ordered the change for the Nebraska boys' benefit.

The Nebraskans are now stationed in Blockhouses Nos. 5, 6 and 7. The blockhouses are situated close to the old Nebraska camp, Santa Mesa, and about three miles from Manila. It will be remembered that the fight with the insurgent army started from these blockhouses. The insurgents in blockhouse No. 7 fired upon our outpost after we had taken one of their sentries who had refused to halt at the command on the night of February 4. Blockhouses Nos. 6 and 7 were captured by the Nebraskans the following morning. The headquarters are stationed at Camp Mesa and all the work of the regiment is transacted from that point.

Big Sugar Deal.

Ventura, Cal.—(Special.)—The Oxnard beet sugar factory and 3,000 acres of land in this county have been transferred by the Pacific Beet Sugar company to the American Beet Sugar company. The deed bears revenue stamps indicating a consideration of \$1,000,000.

This step is one of the most important in the consolidation of the four Oxnard factories. The American Beet Sugar company, recently organized in New York, with a capital stock of \$20,000,000, now owns the factories at Norfolk and Grand Island, Neb., besides the 750-ton factory at Chino and the 2,000-ton factory at Oxnard, just conveyed.

New York.—(Special.)—R. Fulton Cutting, a trustee of the American Beet Sugar company, confirmed the Ventura dispatch, but would give no further information on the plans for consolidation.

BIO PAY OF PREACHERS.

Dr. Hirsch of Chicago Draws \$15,000 a Year.

In offering Dr. Emil G. Hirsch \$15,000 a year for fifteen years to remain as its pastor, Sinai congregation of Chicago will pay him as large a salary as is received by any clergyman in the United States. It is the same that is paid Bishop Potter of New York, who, however, has a rectory furnished, heated and lighted free of cost, and is provided with a private secretary. The late Rev. Dr. Hall of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian church of New York, during the last years of his life, received the largest salary ever paid a clergyman in the United States, which was \$20,000 a year, without the manse. Dr. Hall's salary proper was \$15,000, and \$5,000 additional was contributed by Robert Bonner and two other wealthy members of the congregation. His successor, Mr. Connell, who comes from Regent's Park Presbyterian church of London, is offered \$10,000 and a residence. That is the salary paid to Dr. Gregory, dean of St. Paul's cathedral, and Dr. Bradley, dean of Westminster Abbey, London. Dear Farrar receives \$7,000 a year. The hierarchy of the church of England enjoy enormous salaries, which are necessary to maintain the large establishments required of them. The archbishop of Canterbury received \$60,000 a year, but he needs every cent of it to meet his social and ecclesiastical obligations at Lambeth palace, the home of the primate of the church of England. The salary of the archbishop of London is \$50,000 a year. The archbishop of Ireland receives \$12,500. The other bishops of the church of England are paid from \$10,000 to \$25,000 a year. The average pay of a vicar in England is \$3,500 outside the large cities, in the cities the salary varying according to the wealth of the parish, from \$2,500 to \$10,000.

The Episcopalians and Presbyterians pay larger salaries than any other denominations, but the pulpits most envied in the United States are those of the Collegiate Reformed Dutch church of New York City. There are seven or eight churches of that denomination under the same management and supported from an endowment that is exceedingly rich. Its income is next to that of Trinity church, and amounts to several hundred thousand dollars a year. The pastors of the collegiate churches are paid \$10,000 for life and are allowed to retire from active pastoral work when they reach the age of 65 years.

Trinity parish is the richest in the world, and has an income of about \$200,000 from buildings and other investments. It supports five or six churches, several schools, hospitals and other charitable institutions and pays the manager of its business a salary of \$10,000 a year. The rector of Trinity church receives \$12,500. The same salary is paid by St. Thomas' and St. Bartholomew's. I was informed by good authority that five clergymen in New York city received that salary and at least twelve received \$10,000 a year. The average pay of a clergyman in New York City, excepting the pastors of mission churches, is probably \$6,000.

The editorial profession is not so well paid. There are probably sixteen editors in New York, not proprietors of newspapers, who receive \$10,000 a year or over. The Journal and World have four each, the Herald two, the Times, Post and Brooklyn Eagle one each. The highest editorial salary paid in the United States is \$15,000.

Editorial writers of recognized ability, city editors, news editors and managing editors on the large daily papers are paid from \$5,000 to \$7,500 a year.

A few physicians in New York make very large fees. There are two or three specialists whose incomes will exceed \$50,000 a year, perhaps ten make \$25,000, and perhaps twenty from \$15,000 to \$20,000. Ten thousand dollars a year is considered a large practice.

The salaries of our college professors do not compare with those of Europe, although public school teachers in the United States are paid two or three times as much. The teacher of an ordinary school in England, France or Germany, who makes \$25 a month is doing very well, but several chairs at Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, Glasgow and Aberdeen universities are worth from \$10,000 to \$12,000 a year. The same difference is found in the government service. High officials are paid two or three times as much in Europe as in this country, but ordinary clerks enjoy not more than one-third or one-fourth the compensation that is received for corresponding service in the United States. The university professors in Europe often enjoy hereditary grants and dues from students, which are not customary in the United States. The chair of anatomy in Edinburgh medical faculty is probably the most valuable of any professorship in the world, being worth about \$25,000 a year. One of the professorships in the University of Berlin is worth \$15,000, but there the popularity of a professor has a great deal to do with his compensation. In the United States the college faculties receive from \$1,500 to \$4,000 a year.

We hear a great deal about the enormous fees charged by city lawyers and many of the stories are no doubt true. Nelson Cromwell of New York has the reputation of receiving the largest single fee ever paid to an attorney for a single service, which was \$250,000 cash for advising and assisting Decker, Howell & Co., a firm of brokers, during the panic caused by the collapse of the Villard Northern Pacific syndicate about twelve years ago. His clients not only cheerfully paid him this amount, but after their affairs were settled presented him with a handsome silver service properly inscribed as a testimonial of their confidence and gratitude.

Mr. Cromwell received a similar amount, and some say even more, for his services as counsel for the receivers of the Northern Pacific and Wisconsin Central railroads; \$200,000 was paid to the attorneys who advised the reorganization committee of the Union Pacific railroad, but their services continued for several months and five or six firms were engaged.

Jose Ignacio Rodriguez, a Washington lawyer, received a fee of \$200,000 for settling what was known as the Moran claim against Spain. Grover Cleveland was given a check for \$100,000 by K. C. Benedict for his advice in the organization of the gas trust. Walter S. Logan, of New York, received \$100,000 cash for his services in a recent case in Connecticut. William M. Edwards, Mr. Choate, Alexander & Green, Judge Hoadley, Francis Lynde Stetson and other New York lawyers who do a corporation business have been making a great deal of money recently by assisting in the organization of trusts. Their fees for such services will average \$25,000, but this money is not only divided among several persons, but is used to pay small armies of clerks, stenographers and assistants. A big law firm like Hoadley, Lauterbach & Johnson, will have twenty-five or thirty and some of them even more persons on their pay rolls. Tracy, Boardman & Platt, who are counsel for contractors and other political circles, make a great deal of money. Judge Dillon, the attorney for the Gould system, has a salary of \$25,000 a year. Judge Gary of Chicago, who negotiated the reorganization of the Federal Steel company, is said to have made \$100,000 in a few weeks. President Harrison's fee as counsel for the Venezuelan government before the boundary arbitration at Paris will be \$50,000. Ex-Secretary Tracy, his associate, will receive \$25,000. John W. Foster was paid \$100,000 for his services as adviser to the Chinese government in negotiating the peace treaty with Japan.

The largest salary received by any person in the United States is paid to Mr. Hyde, the president of the Equitable Life Insurance company—\$100,000 a year. He owns the controlling interest in the company and simply takes the money out of one pocket and puts it into another. Frank Thompson, president of the Pennsylvania railroad, receives \$50,000 a year; Chauncey M. Depew, as president of the New York Central, receives \$25,000, and few of the presidents of the great trunk lines are paid less.

John Gates, as president of the Illinois Steel company, received a salary of \$40,000. Four of the managers of the Carnegie company receive \$25,000 each, together with an interest in the profits. At least ten of the Carnegie superintendents receive \$10,000 each.

George Gould, who is president of the Western Union, the Missouri Pacific and several other large corporations, receives no salary from any of them.

Bank presidents in New York, who devote their entire time, are paid from \$10,000 to \$25,000 a year and enjoy unusual opportunities for making money outside. The presidents of some of the largest banks accept no salary at all. Mr. Williams, president of the Chemical National bank, the largest in the United States, is paid \$100 a month for his services.

Lucky Thirteen.

Notwithstanding all our boasted civilization and the efforts of the Thirteen clubs, how few of us there are who are not, in the inmost recesses of our hearts, afraid of the simple number thirteen, says the Philadelphia Times. Deny it as we may, an unpleasant emotion arises in us if, unwittingly, we sit down to dinner where thirteen are to eat. This number, however, was not always regarded as unlucky. In fact, there is plenty of evidence in the folk-lore of ancient peoples to show that in olden times it was held as a lucky number. The history of the Persians, the natives of India, and of the aboriginal Indians of our own western continent amply proves this fact. Biblical students also well know that in testamentary times the Jews were of the same opinion in regard to the mystic number. Thirteen cities were especially dedicated to the priestly tribe; thirteen high-priests descended from Aaron; thirteen kings sat in the high council of the ancients; preparations for the feast of the passover were begun on the thirteenth day of the month of Nisan, and the holy incense consisted of thirteen different odors. Among the long-since extinct tribes of South America the number had a sacred and divine meaning. The inhabitants of Peru counted seven days, without any particular name, in the week. The year had seven times fifty-two days, or four times thirteen years. A father was compelled to support his child to the thirteenth year. The Aztecs had weeks of thirteen days, each with a special name. Their century had fifty years, or four times thirteen. Their public archives were of circular form, with